



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/742,163	12/20/2000	David J. Luman	10002874	9684

7590 08/06/2004
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

PHAM, THIERRY L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 08/06/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/742,163

Applicant(s)

LUMAN, DAVID J.

Examiner

Thierry L Pham

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roosen et al (U.S. 6618163), and in view of Lamming et al (U.S. 5862321).

Regarding claim 1, Roosen discloses a printing system (network printing, fig. 1) product comprising:

(1) initiating software (initiating a print request via a printer driver that is incorporated within the work station, fig. 1 and fig. 9-13, col. 3, lines 8-35 and col. 8, lines 23-42) configured to direct an initiating device to receive a print request including a notification request (notification status report as shown in fig. 9-13), and in response, to transfer a corresponding print job with notification instructions to a printing device (transfer print job from workstation to printer via a network, fig. 1).

(2) a processor-readable storage media (RAM, col. 3, lines 38-45) that stores the initiating software.

However, Roosen does not disclose wherein the wireless notification instructions are configured to direct printing device to transfer a print job status over a wireless link to a wireless receiver that is different from the initiating device.

Lamming, in the same field of endeavor for printing system (network printers, fig. 1), teaches wireless notification instructions are configured to direct printing device to transfer a print job status over a wireless link (multifunctional fax machine sends a print job completion status to PDA via a wireless network, fig. 6a-6b, col. 9, lines 20-27) to a wireless receiver that is different from the initiating device.

Art Unit: 2624

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Roosen as per teachings of Lamming because of a following reason: (1) providing users with remote notification of print job completion status; therefore, to prevent unauthorized access to confidential printed documents by others when the print jobs are completed (col. 9, lines 20-27).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Roosen with Lamming to obtain the invention as specified in claim 1.

Regarding claim 2, Lamming further discloses the printing system product of claim 1 wherein the initiating software is configured to direct the initiating device to collect an identification of the wireless receiver (all PDAs had its own identification number, i.e. Richard's PDA, col. 9, lines 10-26).

Regarding claim 3, Roosen further discloses the printing system product of claim 1 wherein the initiating software is configured to direct the initiating device to collect a selection to either include or exclude print job completion (figs. 9-13) in the print job status.

Regarding claim 4, Roosen further discloses the printing system product of claim 1 wherein the initiating software is configured to direct the initiating device to collect a selection to either include or exclude print job problems ("error", fig. 11) in the print job status.

Regarding claims 5-10 recite the limitations that are in the same scope of invention of claims 1-4, therefore, rejection rationale/basis as described in claims 1-4 also apply to claims 5-10.

Regarding claims 11-18, claims 11-18 are the method claims corresponding to the apparatus claims 1-4. The methods are inherent and included by the operation of the apparatus. Please see claims rejection basis/rationale as described in claims 1-4 above.

Regarding claim 19-20, Lamming also teaches a wireless receiver is a wireless personal assistant and wireless mobile phone (PDA, fig. 2 and mobile phone, col. 11, line 38).

Conclusion

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

(1) U.S. 6240445 to Kumar et al discloses a printer communicating with cellular phone for receiving messages from printer via a wireless network.

(2) U.S. 6430601 to Eldridge et al discloses a printer communicating with cellular phone for transferring and receiving documents via wireless network.


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thierry L Pham whose telephone number is (703) 305-1897. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 AM - 6:00 PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K Moore can be reached on (703)308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Thierry L. Pham

TP


GABRIEL GARCIA
PRIMARY EXAMINER